

The result has been disastrous. According to the Pentagon's own audit, 3 of 12 divisions are no longer combat-ready.

Yes, we must balance the budget, but not by dangerously weakening this country's defenses.

We need to act now to reverse the steady decline our forces have endured since the leftover sixties flower children of the Clinton administration came to town, and act we will, starting today.

NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT ENDANGERS NATIONAL SECURITY

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, what we will take up today is a bill that will cripple America and endanger American military personnel as they have never been endangered before. The bill should be retitled. It should be called the Saddam Hussein Full-Protection Act, because if this piece of legislation that we address today was in place, George Bush could not have pulled the world community together to stop Saddam Hussein's aggression.

But worse than that, in the future it will make every conflict an American conflict. It will make every casualty an American casualty. It will mean every dollar of every conflict will be an American taxpayer dollar.

In the Persian Gulf, 90 percent of the money that that war cost was paid for by other participants, not American taxpayers. It was a world responsibility.

What this legislation will do will cripple the Presidency, leaving him either with the choice of unilateral American action or no action at all.

Defeat this legislation. It endangers our national security.

□ 1115

TURN THE LIGHTS OUT AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am heading up one of four teams of the freshman class which was initiated to carry on the work of many who preceded us here in Congress, in an effort to reduce four Government bureaucracies: Department of Education, Department of Commerce, Department of HUD, and Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Energy is a gas guzzler. Back in the early 1970's the Government imposed price controls and allocation controls, and that contributed to developing a crisis, and the beltway solution here was to come with another bureaucracy, the Department of Energy.

Since then, the Reagan administration eliminated the price controls and

removed the crisis. Now it is time to turn the lights out on the Department of Energy.

You can see from the chart I have here that the Department of Energy has reinvented itself so that now 60 percent of it is a bomb factory. Only 20 percent is related to energy.

Once started, it is hard to eliminate a bureaucracy, but we are working with former secretary Don Hodele and others in Congress because we have a new Congress now, a new voice from the people that wants to downsize the Government.

Our President has talked about downsizing and privatizing, but the Department of Energy has actually increased its budget. Now it is time to tighten the belt and trade in this gas guzzler for a more efficient model.

YELTSIN SHOULD END THE CHECHNYAN WAR

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, this week has seen only fragmented progress toward ending the war in Chechnya. It is my hope when President Yeltsin gives his State of the Union Address tomorrow, he will define a clear strategy to end the Chechen conflict. We must do all we can to pressure President Yeltsin to end this costly and potentially protracted guerrilla war. We have invested a great deal in promoting democracy in Russia, and as long as the U.S. continues to provide aid to Russia, we have an obligation to ensure that Russia continues along this course of reform. The war in Chechnya certainly undermines these efforts, as the Russians have spent over \$2 billion in 8 weeks. Future IMF loans seem unlikely.

Please join me and Representative WOLF in sending a letter to President Clinton urging him not to attend the Moscow summit in May unless the Chechen war is ended. Over 56 Representatives have already signed this letter.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY REVITALIZATION ACT

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the comments by our Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State concerning the fact that they are going to recommend vetoing the National Security Revitalization Act.

This bill addresses a crisis of paramount importance to our Nation, the defense of America.

Not one of our four military services has been left unscathed by the radical defense cuts imposed by the Clinton administration. The numbers are stagger-

ing, amounting to almost 65 percent in real spending dollars already. These massive cuts come at a time when the military is being asked to do more with less, in a world that is still very dangerous and unpredictable.

I served in the U.S. Air Force for 29 years, and I remember all too well the hollow forces of the seventies. I remember squadrons being grounded due to lack of spare parts, and I remember air crews dying because they lacked the proper amount of training. Now I am hearing those same stories again and again.

We as a Congress have no right demanding that our service men and women put their lives on the line at the same time we are slashing the funds they need to perform their mission successfully. We must do everything we can to ensure the safety and security of this Nation and the protection of those who risk their lives for us.

HOME ECONOMICS 100

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, our majority leader tells us that the minimum wage is a bad idea, and that he should know. After all Mr. ARMEY was a college economics professor. Well, maybe he should have taught home economics instead. Every home economics teacher knows about food costs and how far you have to stretch dollars to feed your family.

A home economics teacher shows students how to make meals and bake cookies, but also tells that you have to skip some dinners and desserts if you cannot afford them. And, even though it is a concept far too complicated for someone with a Ph.D. in economics, the fact is that you cannot afford those dinners and desserts if your wages never go up, but minimum wage opponents are not looking at you and your family, they are looking at charts and graphs.

They are not looking at your kitchen table, they are looking at tables of statistics. Well, hard-working Americans earning minimum wage are not statistics. They are real people trying to earn a decent, livable wage. So, I say to minimum wage opponents, maybe you got a Ph.D. in economics, but you get an "F" when it comes to the real economics of real families.

TAKING BACK CONTROL

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Republicans kept another promise we made to the American people in our Contract With America. We